mills and 200 degrees F for its hot rolling mills. In its comments Reynolds states that, in some cases, the lubricant is heated or cooled after the sump but prior to the lubricant nozzles. Thus, measuring temperature in the inlet sump may not always be representative.

USEPA agrees with Reynolds that the temperature of the inlet lubricant supply measured after the inlet sump would be more reflective of the asapplied lubricant temperature and, therefore, the final rule allows temperature measurement after the inlet sump.

D. The proposed rule requires chart recorders for coolant temperature monitoring and coolant temperature recording charts to satisfy recordkeeping requirements. Although Reynolds has installed chart recorders, it would like the option of moving to an electronic data system in the future. USEPA agrees that the use of electronic temperature recorders is an acceptable alternative, and could greatly facilitate data review. Therefore, the final rule allows use of electronic data recorders.

III. Specific RACT Control Requirements and Test Methods

A. Cold Rolling Mills

RACT for the aluminum sheet cold rolling mills Nos. 1 and 7 at the McCook Sheet & Plate plant is the use of a low vapor pressure (as determined by distillation range testing) organic lubricant and a maximum inlet supply rolling lubricant temperature of 150°F. Compliance shall be demonstrated by a monthly distillation range analysis of a grab rolling lubricant sample from each operating mill and daily rolling lubricant temperature readings in the inlet supply feeding each mill.

All incoming shipments of lubricant for the Nos. 1 and 7 cold mills must be sampled and each sample must undergo a distillation range test using ASTM method D86–90, "Standard Test Method for Distillation of Petroleum Products." The initial and final boiling points of the lubricant must be between 460°F and 635°F. Also, for the cold mills, samples of the as-applied lubricants must be taken on a monthly basis to verify, using ASTM method D86–90, that the boiling points are between 460°F and 635°F.

B. Hot Rolling Mills

RACT for the aluminum sheet and plate hot rolling mills, 120 inch, 96 inch, 80 inch and 145 inch mills, at the McCook Sheet & Plate plant is the use of an oil/water emulsion (rolling lubricant) not to exceed 15% by weight of petroleum-based oil and additives and a maximum inlet supply rolling lubricant temperature of 200°F. Compliance shall be demonstrated by a monthly analysis of a grab rolling lubricant sample from each operating mill and daily temperature readings in the inlet supply feeding each mill.

The lubricants at each hot mill must be sampled and tested, for the percentage of oil and water, on a monthly basis. ASTM Method D95–83 (Reapproved 1990), "Standard Test Method For Water in Petroleum Products and Bituminous Materials by Distillation", shall be used to determine the percent by weight of petroleumbased oil and additives.

C. Coolant Temperature Monitoring

Coolant temperatures shall be monitored at all of the rolling mills by use of thermocouple probes and chart recorders or electronic data recorders. The probes sense the coolant temperatures at the supply side to the mills.

D. Recordkeeping

All distillation test results for cold mill lubricants, all percent oil test results for hot mill lubricants, all coolant temperature recording charts and/or temperature data obtained from electronic data recorders, and all oil/ water emulsion formulation records shall be kept on file, and be available for inspection by USEPA, for three years.

IV. Compliance Date

A compliance date of four months from promulgation is required so that Reynolds has adequate time to comply with revised recordkeeping requirements.

V. Summary and Conclusions

This rule establishes site-specific RACT requirements, revised recordkeeping requirements, and revised test methods for Reynold's aluminum rolling mills. These requirements are consistent with USEPA's notice of proposed rulemaking as modified by Reynolds' comments. The use of lower VOC emitting lubricants and lubricant temperature control has been previously approved by USEPA as RACT for another aluminum rolling mill (55 FR 33904). Compliance with the revised emission limits and recordkeeping requirements must be achieved four months from USEPA's publication of this rule. Also, as proposed, the USEPA is withdrawing the June 23, 1992, stay.

USEPA is taking this action pursuant to its authority under section 110(k)(6)of the Act to correct through rulemaking

any plan or plan revision.4 The USEPA is interpreting this provision to authorize USEPA to make corrections to a promulgated regulation when it is shown to USEPA's satisfaction that the information made available to USEPA at the time of promulgation is subsequently demonstrated to have been clearly inadequate, and other information persuasively supports a change in the regulation. See 57 FR 6762 at 6763 (November 30, 1992). In this case, the information made available to USEPA during the rulemaking for Reynolds was clearly inadequate for the development of a site-specific RACT determination.5

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has exempted this regulatory action from Executive Order 12866 review.

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 600 et seq., USEPA must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis assessing the impact of any proposed or final rule on small entities. 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604. Alternatively, USEPA may certify that the rule will not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-forprofit enterprises, and government entities with jurisdiction over populations of less than 50,000.

This action involves only one source, Reynolds Metals Company. (Reynolds is not a small entity.) Therefore, USEPA certifies that this RACT promulgation does not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by May 9, 1995. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purpose of

⁵ As discussed earlier, USEPA was required to promulgate the June 29, 1990 FIP regulations under the tight timeframe ordered by the Court in *Wisconsin* v. *Reilly*.

⁴Since USEPA is taking this action pursuant to section 110(k)(6), USEPA believes that section 193 of the Act (the savings clause) is inapplicable. By its terms, section 110(k)(6) does not require any additional submission or evidence. Section 193 requires an assurance of equivalency for any revision. In order to provide for equivalency, the State would need to provide for compensating reductions. USEPA believes that this conflict should be resolved concluding that section 110(k)(6) is not constrained by the savings clause requirement of equivalent reductions. USEPA believes that the state and the sources within the state should not have to bear the burden of additional reductions where USEPA lacked important site-specific information at the time of an initial promulgation. This is particularly true in the case of FIPs, where USEPA takes the lead in developing the regulations and is not merely acting on state-submitted regulations.